

2008 AMAO Determinations		AYP	Progress		Attainment		Did the district make all 3 AMAO targets for 2008?	Did the district make all 3 AMAO targets for 2007?	Does the district need to write a district improvement plan?  Yes - if missed targets 2 years in a row.
Definition		Calculations pulled directly from LEP subgroup at the district level on the ISAT.	% of LEP students in the district who must advance one level of language proficiency on the IELA.		% of LEP students in the district who must attain proficiency on the IELA. Proficiency = Fluent overall <u>AND</u> EF+ (Early Fluent and above) in each sub domain.				
Targets		78% Reading 70% Math 78% LU	55%		20%				
State Results	Idaho	NO	NO	36.60%	NO	15.08%			
District No.	District								
1	Boise	NO	NO	43.57%	NO	12.83%	NO	NO	Yes
2	Meridian	NO	NO	41.59%	NO	19.83%	NO	NO	Yes
3	Kuna	YES*	NO	41.57%	NO	19.20%	NO	NO (consortia with Melba in 2007)	Yes
11	Meadows Valley	No LEP students					NA*	NA*	NA*
13	Council	No LEP students					no LEP	no LEP	NA*
21	Marsh Valley	No LEP students					no LEP	no LEP	NA*
25	Pocatello	YES*	NO	36.11%	NO	9.23%	NO	NO (consortia with Preston in 2007)	Yes
33	Bear Lake	NA - less than 10					NA*	NA*	NA*
41	St. Maries	NA - less than 10					NA*	NA*	NA*
44	Plummer-Worley	No LEP students					no LEP	no LEP	NA*
52	Snake River	YES*	NO	34.25%	NO	17.42%	NO	NO	Yes
55	Blackfoot	YES*	NO	29.69%	NO	14.84%	NO	NO	Yes
58	Aberdeen	NO	NO	32.01%	YES	23.12%	NO	NO	Yes
59	Firth	NA - less than 10	NO	33.33%	YES	26.67%	NO	YES	NO
60	Shelley	YES*	NO	44.35%	NO	19.74%	NO	NO	Yes
61	Blaine	NO	NO	36.10%	NO	11.93%	NO	NO	Yes
71	Garden Valley	No LEP students					NA*	NA*	NA*
72	Basin	NA- less than 10					NA*	NA*	NA*
73	Horseshoe Bend	No LEP students					NA*	NA*	NA*
83	West Bonner	NA - less than 10					NA*	NA*	NA*
84	Lake Pend Orielle	NA - less than 10					NA*	NA*	NA*
91	Idaho Falls	NO	NO	34.95%	NO	10.77%	NO	NO	Yes
92	Swan Valley	No LEP students					no LEP	no LEP	NA*
93	Bonneville	YES*	NO	30.77%	NO	8.63%	NO	NO	Yes
101	Boundary	YES*	NO	34.78%	YES	24.14%	NO	NO	Yes
111	Butte Co.	No LEP students					no LEP	NA*	NA*
121	Camas Co.	No LEP students					no LEP	no LEP	NA*
131	Nampa	NO	NO	37.35%	NO	7.52%	NO	NO	Yes
132	Caldwell	NO	NO	36.15%	NO	14.78%	NO	NO	Yes
133	Wilder	NO	NO	30.61%	YES	21.21%	NO	NO	Yes
134	Middleton	NO	NO	33.33%	YES	24.73%	NO	NO (consortia with Notus in 2007)	Yes
135	Notus	YES*	NO	28.30%	NO	11.94%	NO	NO (consortia with Middleton in 2007)	Yes
136	Melba	YES*	NO	52.17%	NO	19.40%	NO	NO (consortia with Kuna in 2007)	Yes

2008 AMAO Determinations		AYP	Progress	Attainment		Did the district make all 3 AMAO targets for 2008?	Did the district make all 3 AMAO targets for 2007?	Does the district need to write a district improvement plan?  Yes - if missed targets 2 years in a row.	
Definition		Calculations pulled directly from LEP subgroup at the district level on the ISAT.	% of LEP students in the district who must advance one level of language proficiency on the IELA.	% of LEP students in the district who must attain proficiency on the IELA. Proficiency = Fluent overall <b>AND</b> EF+ (Early Fluent and above) in each sub domain.					
Targets		78% Reading 70% Math 78% LU	55%	20%					
137	Parma	NO	NO	23.20%	NO	13.40%	NO	NO	Yes
139	Vallivue	YES*	NO	36.71%	NO	15.86%	NO	NO	Yes
148	Grace	NA - less than 10	NO	22.22%	YES	15.38%	NO	NO	Yes
149	North Gem	No LEP students					no LEP	no LEP	NA*
150	Soda Springs	NA - less than 10					NA*	no LEP	NA*
151	Cassia Co.	NO	NO	32.63%	NO	13.43%	NO	NO	Yes
161	Clark Co.	NA- less than 10	NO	22.50%	NO	15.25%	NO	NO	Yes
171	Orofino	NA - less than 10					NA*	NA*	NA*
181	Challis	NA - less than 10	NO	28.57%	YES	20.00%	NO	NO	Yes
182	Mackay	No LEP students					NA*	NA*	NA*
191	Prairie Elem.	No LEP students					no LEP	no LEP	NO
192	Glenns Ferry	YES*	NO	34.96%	NO	17.93%	NO	NO	Yes
193	Mountain Home	NO	NO	29.52%	NO	11.39%	NO	NO	Yes
201	Preston	NO	NO	40.00%	NO	17.48%	NO	NO	Yes
202	West Side	NA - less than 10					NA*	NA*	NA*
215	Fremont Co.	NO	NO	36.98%	NO	18.18%	NO	NO	Yes
221	Emmett	NO	NO	32.39%	YES	20.20%	NO	NO	Yes
231	Gooding	NO	NO	45.21%	NO	12.61%	NO	NO	Yes
232	Wendell	YES*	NO	42.74%	YES	22.90%	NO	NO	Yes
233	Hagerman	YES*	NO	44.83%	YES	28.57%	NO	NO	Yes
234	Bliss	YES*	NO	42.86%	NO	19.05%	NO	NO	Yes
242	Cottonwood	No LEP students					no LEP	no LEP	NA*
243	Salmon River	No LEP students					no LEP	no LEP	NA*
244	Mountain View	No LEP students					no LEP	no LEP	NA*
251	Jefferson Co.	YES*	NO	32.14%	NO	11.88%	NO	NO	Yes
252	Ririe	No LEP students					no LEP	no LEP	NA*
253	West Jefferson	NO	NO	36.61%	NO	12.86%	NO	NO	Yes
261	Jerome	NO	NO	35.76%	NO	17.59%	NO	NO	Yes
262	Valley	NO	NO	27.14%	NO	13.46%	NO	NO	Yes
271	Coeur d'Alene	NA- less than 10	NO	47.06%	YES	25.00%	NO	NO	Yes
272	Lakeland	No LEP students					no LEP	no LEP	NA*
273	Post Falls	NA - less than 10					NA*	no LEP	NO
274	Kootenai	No LEP students					no LEP	no LEP	NA*
281	Moscow	NA - less than 10	YES	100.00%	NO	18.18%	NO	YES	NO
282	Genesee	No LEP students					no LEP	no LEP	NA*
283	Kendrick	No LEP students					no LEP	no LEP	NA*
285	Potlatch	No LEP students					no LEP	no LEP	NA*
287	Troy	No LEP students					no LEP	no LEP	NA*
288	Whitepine	No LEP students					no LEP	no LEP	NA*
291	Salmon	NA - less than 10					NA*	no LEP	NA*
292	South Lemhi	No LEP students					NA*	NA*	NA*
302	Nezperce	No LEP students					no LEP	no LEP	NA*
304	Kamiah	NA - less than 10					NA*	NA*	NA*
305	Highland	No LEP students					no LEP	no LEP	NA*
312	Shoshone	NO	NO	33.58%	NO	9.34%	NO	NO	Yes
314	Dietrich	NA - less than 10	YES	100.00%	NO	10.00%	NO	NO	Yes
316	Richfield	NA - less than 10					NA*	NO	NO
321	Madison	YES*	NO	29.19%	NO	17.23%	NO	NO	Yes
322	Sugar-Salem	YES*	NO	30.77%	YES	20.00%	NO	NO	Yes
331	Minidoka	NO	NO	35.16%	NO	15.98%	NO	NO	Yes
340	Lewiston	NA - less than 10	NO	44.44%	YES	25.00%	NO	YES	NO
341	Lapwai	No LEP students					no LEP	no LEP	NA*
342	Culdesac	No LEP students					no LEP	no LEP	NA*
351	Oneida Co.	YES*	NO	26.67%	NO	10.00%	NO	NO	Yes
363	Marsing	YES*	NO	38.51%	NO	17.71%	NO	NO	Yes
364	Pleasant Valley	No LEP students					no LEP	no LEP	NA*
365	Bruneau-Grandview	YES*	NO	33.33%	NO	6.98%	NO	NO	Yes
370	Homedale	NO	NO	34.82%	NO	17.69%	NO	NO	Yes
371	Payette	NO	NO	34.65%	NO	18.59%	NO	NO	Yes
372	New Plymouth	YES*	NO	39.29%	NO	18.42%	NO	NO	Yes
373	Fruitland	YES*	NO	43.40%	NO	16.85%	NO	NO	Yes
381	American Falls	NO	NO	39.60%	NO	14.10%	NO	NO	Yes
382	Rockland	No LEP students					no LEP	no LEP	NA*
383	Arbon Elem.	No LEP students					no LEP	no LEP	NA*

2008 AMAO Determinations		AYP	Progress		Attainment		Did the district make all 3 AMAO targets for 2008?	Did the district make all 3 AMAO targets for 2007?	Does the district need to write a district improvement plan? Yes - if missed targets 2 years in a row.
Definition		Calculations pulled directly from LEP subgroup at the district level on the ISAT.	% of LEP students in the district who must advance one level of language proficiency on the IELA.		% of LEP students in the district who must attain proficiency on the IELA. Proficiency = Fluent overall AND EF+ (Early Fluent and above) in each sub domain.				
Targets		78% Reading 70% Math 78% LU	55%		20%				
391	Kellogg	No LEP students					no LEP	no LEP	NA*
392	Mullan	No LEP students					no LEP	no LEP	NA*
393	Wallace	No LEP students					no LEP	no LEP	NA*
394	Avery	No LEP students					no LEP	no LEP	NA*
401	Teton	NO	NO	20.83%	NO	13.90%	NO	NO	Yes
411	Twin Falls	YES*	NO	49.44%	NO	13.20%	NO	NO	Yes
412	Buhl	NO	NO	35.20%	YES	21.72%	NO	NO	Yes
416	Three Creek	No LEP students					no LEP	no LEP	NA*
417	Castleford	NA - less than 10	NO	42.86%	YES	47.37%	NO	NO	Yes
421	McCall-Donnelly	YES*	YES	76.19%	YES	44.83%	YES	NO	NO
422	Cascade	NA- less than 10					NA*	no LEP	NA*
431	Weiser	YES*	NO	37.70%	YES	20.57%	NO	NO	Yes
432	Cambridge	No LEP students					no LEP	no LEP	NA*
433	Midvale	NA - less than 10					NA*	NA*	NA*
451	Victory Charter School	No LEP students					no LEP	no LEP	NA*
452	Idaho Virtual Academy - Charter	No LEP students					NA*	NA*	NA*
453	Richard McKenna Charter High School	No LEP students					no LEP	no LEP	NA*
454	Rolling Hills Public Charter School	No LEP students					no LEP	no LEP	NA*
455	Compass Public Charter School	No LEP students					no LEP	no LEP	NA*
456	Falcon Ridge Charter School	No LEP students					no LEP	no LEP	NA*
457	INSPIRE Virtual Charter School	No LEP students					no LEP	no LEP	NA*
458	Liberty Charter School	No LEP students					no LEP	no LEP	NA*
459	Garden City Community School - Charter	NA - less than 10					NA*	NA*	NA*
460	Academy at Roosevelt - Charter	No LEP students					no LEP	No LEP	NA*
461	Taylor's Crossing Charter School	No LEP students					no LEP	No LEP	NA*
462	Xavier Charter School	No LEP students					no LEP	No LEP	NA*
463	Vision Public Charter School	No LEP students					no LEP	No LEP	NA*
464	White Pine Charter School	No LEP students					no LEP	No LEP	NA*
596	Idaho School for the Deaf and Blind	NA - less than 10					NA*	NA*	NA*
786	Idaho Distance Education Academy - Charter	NA - less than 10					NA*	NA*	NA*
Districts in a Consortium - These districts are reported together, as they accept Title III funds jointly. Accountability measures are also joined.									
413 and 414	Filer and Kimberly	YES*	NO	34.62%	NO	13.46%	NO	NO	Yes
415 and 418	Hansen and Murtaugh	YES*	NO	52.94%	YES	25.00%	NO	NO	Yes

#### Key Information

No LEP students in the district

Title III funded district in 07-08 - information will be reported to the U.S. Department of Education for Title III funded districts only

\*NA - less than 10 LEP students. Unable to report publicly, due to FERPA regulations. Districts that had less than 10 students test on the ISAT but 10 or more students test on the IELA, will receive AMAO calculation for "progress" and "attainment".

\*YES - less than 34 students or safe harbor. AYP determinations are not made for district subgroups of less than 34 students, so they are considered as making AYP. Safe harbor districts are considered making AYP when the percent of not proficient students decreases 10% from 2007 to 2008, in addition to meeting the 3rd indicator (Language Usage Assessment). For these districts, the remaining 2 AMAOs will still be calculated.





